



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

known. This is Wrede's thesis. Mark writes in order to explain why Jesus was not recognized by his contemporaries as the Messiah. His explanation is that he did not wish to be recognized until after the resurrection. He takes special pains to hide his messiahship from men. He commands the sick whom he has healed, not to publish the miraculous way of their cure. He enjoins silence on the demons that seem to know him. He creates a special circle of three among his followers to keep the secret. He speaks in parables, chiefly in order to conceal his personality. He hints at a mystery of the kingdom (*μυστήριον τῆς βασιλείας*) which can be nothing else than that he himself is the Messiah. It is along this line that Wrede builds his argument for the tendency origin of the gospel of Mark. In Matthew and Luke the idea of a secret messiahship is still present, but does not constitute the center of the narratives. In the fourth gospel there is no longer a question of self-concealment on the part of Jesus. He can claim that he has spoken openly before the people.

From this brief sketch of Wrede's argument, it will be easily seen that his treatise involves much more than the investigation of a specific question. It is, in fact, an effort to explain the reports of the life and work of Jesus as the result of a rapid and radical transformation within a very short period. The real Jesus is, according to this portraiture, soon lost in the cloud of opinions formed about him by his followers. The gospels may not be mythical, but they certainly cannot serve as reliable sources of information about him. Wrede deprecates subjectivity in criticism, but his method of treating the sources leaves him practically nothing but the subjective element to work with. Critical sensitiveness may be developed to abnormality, just as the optic nerve may become so acute in its response to the touch of light that it will not perceive things in their real proportions and colors. This is what we fear has come to pass in the case of our author.

A. C. ZENOS.

THE MCCORMICK THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

PATRISTIC STUDY. By HENRY BARCLAY SWETE. (= "Handbooks for the Clergy.") New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1902. Pp. xi + 194. \$0.90, *net*.

THESE pleasant pages are designed to introduce the clerical reader to patristic literature in its widest sense. From Clement of Rome down to Photius and Bede every important Christian writer in Greek or Latin

is briefly described and estimated. The necessary brevity of these treatments has left no room for the discussion or even the statement of those literary and historical problems which really give to patristic study its chief interest, and it is a fair question whether a more effective way to attract men to the study of the Fathers would not have been to present a series of these problems with some indication of the directions in which the solution of them must be sought. Sometimes this brevity of treatment amounts almost to bareness, and one feels, regretfully, how much is being withheld. A *Patristic Study* of thrice the compass of the present book would have been most welcome from the pen of Professor Swete. As a comprehensive and sympathetic sketch of patristic literature, however, the book, small as it is, promises to be useful and even valuable, while its price puts it within the reach of all. In some details there is room for difference of opinion. The statement that the best tradition represents Clement as bishop of Rome, "second in succession after St. Peter and St. Paul" (p. 12), should certainly be modified to read "third in succession;" for the order Linus, Anacletus, Clement seems quite incontestable. It may also be questioned whether the gospels according to the Hebrews and Egyptians may not be earlier than the second century, to which Professor Swete assigns them (p. 39).

EDGAR J. GOODSPEED.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

DIODORUS VON TARSUS. Vier Pseudojustinische Schriften als Eigentum Diodors nachgewiesen. Von ADOLF HARNACK. (*Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, N. F., VI, 40.) Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1901. Pp. 251. M. 8.

HARNACK's brilliant ingenuity has made a fruitful discovery in old possessions. He attacks the problem of the authorship of four pseudo-Justinian documents of the Codex Parisinus 450: *Quaestiones et Responsiones ad Orthodoxos*, *Quaestiones Gentilium ad Christianos*, *Quaestiones Christianorum ad Gentiles*, *Confutatio Dogmatum Aristotelis*. Harnack translates the first three and the theological portion of the fourth, and presents a fascinating theory of the authorship, with a concluding summary of the theological and philosophical characteristics of the works. Interest in them had been quiescent until Papadopoulos Kerameus in 1895 found a more original text of the *Quaestiones et Responsiones*, attributed in the codex to Theodoret. Agreeing with